arXiv:1602.05657v2 [cs.CC] 15 Nov 2016

The Computational Complexity of the Frobenius Problem

Shunichi Matsubara
Aoyama Gakuin University
matsubara@it.aoyama.ac.jp

Abstract

In this paper, as a main theorem, we prove that the decision version of the Frobenius problem is Σ_2^{P}-complete under Karp reductions. Given a finite set A of coprime positive integers, we call the greatest integer that cannot be represented as a nonnegative integer combination of A the *Frobenius number*, and we denote it as $g(A)$. We call a problem of finding $g(A)$ for a given A the *Frobenius problem*; moreover, we call a problem of determining whether $g(A) \geq k$ for a given pair (A, k) the decision version of the Frobenius problem, where A is a finite set of coprime positive integers and k is a positive integer. For the proof, we construct two Karp reductions. First, we reduce a 2-alternating version of the 3-dimensional matching problem, which is known to be Π_2^{P}-complete, to a 2-alternating version of the integer knapsack problem. Then, we reduce the variant of the integer knapsack problem to the complement of the decision version of the Frobenius problem. As a corollary, we obtain the main theorem.

1 Introduction

The Frobenius problem has attracted the interest of a number of mathematicians and computer scientists since the 19-th century ([31], Problem C7 in [14], [27], and Chapter 1 in [4]). Let $A = \{a_1, \cdots, a_n\}$ be a set of coprime integers such that $2 \leq a_1 < \cdots < a_n$, where $n \geq 2$. We call the greatest integer that cannot be represented as a nonnegative integer combination of A the *Frobenius number* of A, and we denote it as $g(A)$. For example, given $\{4, 6, 7\}$, the Frobenius number $g(\{4, 6, 7\})$ is 9. Generally, a function problem that asks for the Frobenius number for a given finite set of coprime positive integers is called the *Frobenius problem* [27]. In this paper, we denote this original version of the problem as FFrobenius. We denote the decision version of the Frobenius problem as Frobenius, which determines whether $g(A) \geq k$ for a given finite set A of coprime positive integers and a positive integer k. Moreover, we denote the complement problem of Frobenius as coFrobenius.

1.1 Results of This Work

In this paper, we prove that FROBENIUS is Σ_2^{P}-complete under Karp reductions as a main theorem. This result provides the first nontrivial upper bound and an improved lower bound for the computational complexity of FFROBENIUS. FFROBENIUS has been proven to be NP-hard under Cook reductions [26]. However, to the best of the author's knowledge, little other research has been conducted on any variant of the Frobenius problem from a complexity theoretical perspective. Σ_2^{P} is the complexity class at the second level of the polynomial hierarchy [21]. Every problem in Σ_2^{P} can be computed in nondeterministic polynomial time by using an NP oracle. Π_2^{P} is the class of the complements of problems in Σ_2^{P}. Ramírez-Alfonsín proposed an open question of whether FROBENIUS is NP-complete under Karp reductions in his monograph (Section A.1 in [27]). This work is also an answer for that open question.

We prove the Σ_2^{P}-completeness of FROBENIUS as follows. First, we construct a Karp reduction from $\Pi_2$3D MATCHING to Π_2ASSOC INTEGER KNAPSACK. $\Pi_2$3D MATCHING is a 2-alternating variant of the 3-dimensional matching problem (Section A3.2 in [12]). $\Pi_2$3D MATCHING is known to be Π_2^{P}-complete due to [20]. Π_2ASSOC INTEGER KNAPSACK is a 2-alternating version of the integer knapsack problem (Section A6 in [12] and Section 15.7 in [25]). Π_2ASSOC INTEGER KNAPSACK is introduced in this paper. We define this problem by associating with FROBENIUS. Then, we prove the membership of COFROBENIUS to Π_2^{P} and the Π_2^{P}-hardness of COFROBENIUS. The Π_2^{P}-hardness is proven by constructing a Karp reduction from Π_2ASSOC INTEGER KNAPSACK to COFROBENIUS. As a corollary, we obtain the Σ_2^{P}-completeness of FROBENIUS. This means that Σ_2^{P} is a lower bound for the complexity class of FFROBENIUS.

Moreover, as a corollary of the Σ_2^{P}-completeness of FROBENIUS, we show that $\mathsf{F}\Delta_3^{\mathsf{P}}$ is an upper bound for FFROBENIUS. Then, we demonstrate that the Σ_2^{P}-hardnesses of FROBENIUS and FFROBENIUS are weak in the sense that there are pseudopolynomial algorithms.

1.2 Related Work

1.2.1 Fast Algorithms for Solving the Frobenius Problem

Prior to this work, the computational difficulty of the Frobenius problem was recognized based on the result of [26] from a theoretical perspective. However, many practically fast algorithms have been actively developed (Chapter 1 in [27]). Nijenhuis [22] developed a practically fast algorithm for any instance. He provided a characterization of the Frobenius number by a weighted directed graph. His algorithm is a variant of Dijkstra's algorithm for the single-source shortest path problem over the graph. Böcker and Lipták [6] developed a practically fast algorithm and applied it to solve a problem in bioinformatics. Einstein, Lichtblau, Strzebonski, and Wagon [9]

developed some algorithms through the use of some mathematical programming techniques. For a given set A of input integers, if the number of elements of A is of logarithmic order of the smallest element of A, then that algorithm can run very fast.

Beihoffer, Hendry, Nijenhuis, and Wagon [5] developed some algorithms by extending the algorithm of Nijenhuis [22]. Practically, their algorithms are considered to be the best algorithms under no restriction for inputs. Roune [28] implemented an algorithm using Gröbner bases. Using this algorithm, he computed the Frobenius numbers for inputs of thousands digits. However, this algorithm is only practical if the number of a given set of positive integers is sufficiently small.

1.2.2 Computation of the Frobenius Problem for Inputs of a Fixed Number of Integers

If we assume that the number n of input positive integers is fixed, then there are polynomial-time algorithms. In the case where $n = 2$, for any coprime positive integers a_1 and a_2, the Frobenius number can be calculated using the formula $a_1a_2 - a_1 - a_2$, whose discoverer is unknown. In the case where $n = 3$, polynomial-time algorithms are known, e.g., the algorithm proposed by Davison [7]. In the case of any $n \geq 2$, polynomial-time algorithms were found by Kannan [16] and Barvinok and Woods [3].

1.2.3 Upper and Lower Bounds for the Frobenius Number

Although Frobenius cannot be efficiently computed unless $\mathsf{P} = \mathsf{NP}$, some upper bounds are known for the Frobenius number. Let $A = \{a_1, \cdots, a_n\}$ be a set of coprime integers such that $2 \leq a_1 < \cdots < a_n$, where $n \geq 2$. For example, the following general upper bounds are known. A simple upper bound a_n^2 was found by Wilf [33]. Another upper bound $2a_n\lfloor a_1/n \rfloor - a_1$ was found by Erdös and Graham [10]. The upper bound found by Krawczyk and Paz [18] is attractive because this bound has the same order of magnitude as the Frobenius number and can be computed in polynomial time under the assumption that n is fixed. Generally, we cannot know whether a bound is superior to another since it depends on a given set of positive integers. Some lower bounds are also known. For example, Davison [7] found a sharp lower bound $\sqrt{3a_1a_2a_3} - a_1 - a_2 - a_3$ of the Frobenius number in the case where $n = 3$. Aliev and Gruber [1] found that $((n-1)!\Pi_{i=1}^n a_i)^{1/(n-1)} - \sum_{i=1}^n a_i$.

1.2.4 Computational Complexity

The complexity classes Σ_2^{P} and Π_2^{P} have been actively researched. Stockmeyer proved that the problems Σ_2Sat and Π_2Sat are Σ_2^{P}-complete and Π_2^{P}-complete, respectively [30]. Σ_2Sat and Π_2Sat are extensions to the Σ_2^{P} and Π_2^{P} variants of the satisfiability problem, respectively. McLoughlin

proved that the covering radius problem for linear codes is Π_2^{P}-complete [20]. This problem is defined as follows. *Given a pair (A, w), where A is an (m, n)-matrix and w is an integer, for any n-vector y, is there an m-vector x such that $xA = y$ and the Hamming weight of x is not greater than w?* She showed the Π_2^{P}-completeness of the covering radius problem using two Karp reductions. First, she reduced Π_2SAT to $\Pi_2$3D MATCHING; then, she reduced $\Pi_2$3D MATCHING to the covering radius problem. Umans [32] proved that the minimum equivalent DNF problem is Σ_2^{P}-complete. This problem is defined as follows. *Given a pair (φ, k), where φ is a Boolean formula and k is an integer, is there an equivalent formula ψ to φ with at most k occurrences of literals?* Umans showed the Σ_2^{P}-completeness of the minimum equivalent DNF problem using two Karp reductions. A survey by Schäfer and Umans [29] provided a comprehensive list of numerous problems at the second and third levels in the polynomial hierarchy and their related results, which was written in the style of [12].

1.2.5 Covering Radius Problem

The Frobenius problem is closely related to the covering radius problem for lattices and linear codes. The result of McLoughlin [20], described above, is an example. The covering radius problem and the Frobenius problem belong to classes at the second level of the polynomial hierarchy, although the membership of the Frobenius problem will be shown in a later section of this paper. As more general research for the complexity of the covering radius problem, Guruswami, Micciancio, and Regev [13] investigated the approximability of the covering radius problem and its related problems for lattices and linear codes. Kannan [16] found the following relation for the Frobenius number and a type of covering radius for a lattice. Given a set A of coprime integers $a_1, \cdots, a_n$ such that $2 \leq a_1 < \cdots < a_n$, $R(P, L)$ is equal to $g(A) + \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i$. P is a polytope such that $(x_1, \cdots, x_{n-1}) \in P$ if and only if $x_1, \cdots, x_{n-1}$ are real numbers and $\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} a_i x_i \leq 1$. L is a lattice such that $(x_1, \cdots, x_{n-1}) \in L$ if and only if $x_1, \cdots, x_{n-1}$ are integers and $\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} a_i x_i$ is congruent to 0 modulo a_n. $R(P, L)$ is a covering radius of P for L.

1.3 Organization

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we define some related concepts and notations. In Section 3, we prove the Π_2^{P}-completeness of Π_2ASSOC INTEGER KNAPSACK. Then, in Section 4, we prove FROBENIUS to be Σ_2^{P}-complete as a main theorem. In Section 5, we discuss lower bounds and upper bounds for FFROBENIUS by using the main theorem. Section 6 describes the weak Σ_2^{P}-hardnesses of FFROBENIUS and FROBENIUS. Finally, Section 7 concludes this work and describes open problems and future work.

2 Preliminaries

2.1 Basic Concepts and Notations

We denote the sets of all nonnegative and positive integers as $\mathbb{N}$ and $\mathbb{N}_+$, respectively. For any i, j in $\mathbb{N}$ with $i \leq j$, we denote the integer interval $\{k \in \mathbb{N} \colon i \leq k \leq j\}$ as $[i, j]$.

2.2 Representations for Positive Integers

For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\overline{n}$ be a new symbol. For any $N \subseteq \mathbb{N}$, let $\overline{N}$ denote the set $\{\overline{n} \colon n \in \mathbb{N}\}$. Let b be a nonnegative integer. Let $n_1, \cdots, n_k$ be integers in $[0, b-1]$. Then, we call the sequence $\overline{n_k} \cdots \overline{n_1}$ the *k-place b-representation* for integer $\sum_{i=1}^{k} n_i b^{i-1}$. We often denote the integer $\sum_{i=1}^{k} n_i b^{i-1}$ as $(\overline{n_k} \cdots \overline{n_1})_b$. For notational convenience, we often denote a k-place b-representation $\overline{n_k} \cdots \overline{n_1}$ as $\overline{n_k \cdots n_1}$. For any k-place b-representation $\overline{n_k} \cdots \overline{n_1}$, we call k and b its *length* and *base*, respectively. Moreover, for every $i \in [1, k]$, we call n_i its *i-th digit*. We often omit *"k-place"* or *"b-"*. Let r be $\overline{n_k} \cdots \overline{n_1}$. For any $i \in [1, k]$, we denote the i-th digit $\overline{n_i}$ as $r[i]$. For every $i, j \in [1, k]$ with $i \leq j$, we call $\overline{n_i} \cdots \overline{n_j}$ a *subrepresentation* and denote it as $r[i, j]$. For every $n \in [0, b-1]$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}$, we define $\overline{n}^m$ inductively as follows. (1) $\overline{n}^0 = \varepsilon$, (2) $\overline{n}^{m+1} = \overline{n}^m \overline{n}$ where ε denotes the empty representation.

We apply some concepts on integers to their b-representations. We define an *addition* of b-representations as follows. Let $r_1, \cdots, r_l$ be k-place b-representations, where $b, k, l \in \mathbb{N}_+$. Let i be an integer in $[0, k]$. Then, we define integers d_i and c_i inductively as follows. (1) $d_0 = 0$ and $c_0 = 0$. (2) If $i \in [1, k]$, then d_i is the floor of the quotient of $\sum_{j=1}^{l} (r_j[i])_b + c_{i-1}$ divided by b, and c_i is the remainder of $\sum_{j=1}^{l} (r_j[i])_b + c_{i-1}$ divided by b. Then, we call $\overline{d_k} \cdots \overline{d_1}$ the *sum* of $r_1, \cdots, r_l$, and the operation for computing the sum is the *addition* of $r_1, \cdots, r_l$. We call c_i the *carry* at the i-th digit in the addition. We say that a carry *occurs* at the i-th digit in the addition of $r_1, \cdots, r_l$ if $c_i \neq 0$. We define ordering relations $<, \leq, =, \geq, >$ over b-representations as follows. Let n and n' be nonnegative integers, and let r and r' be their b-representations, respectively. Let $\circ$ be any symbol in $\{<, \leq, =, \geq, >\}$. Then, $r \circ r'$ if and only if $n \circ n'$.

2.3 Complexity Classes

In this subsection, we review some fundamental concepts that are closely related to this paper. We assume that the reader is familiar with the basis of computational complexity theory. If necessary, the reader is referred to some standard textbooks, e.g., [2, 12]. We define the classes Δ_k^{P}, Σ_k^{P}, and Π_k^{P}, where $k \geq 0$, in the polynomial hierarchy inductively as follows. Each of Δ_0^{P}, Σ_0^{P}, and Π_0^{P} is the class P. For any $k \geq 1$, Δ_k^{P}, Σ_k^{P}, and Π_k^{P} are

the classes $\mathsf{P}^{\Sigma_{k-1}^{\mathsf{P}}}$, $\mathsf{NP}^{\Sigma_{k-1}^{\mathsf{P}}}$, and $\mathsf{coNP}^{\Sigma_{k-1}^{\mathsf{P}}}$, respectively. These definitions originate from [21]. For every $k \geq 0$, we define $\mathsf{D}_k^{\mathsf{P}}$ as the class of all of the problems L such that L is the intersection of some $L_1 \in \Sigma_k^{\mathsf{P}}$ and $L_2 \in \Pi_k^{\mathsf{P}}$. This definition originates from [35]. By definition, the classes Σ_1^{P}, Π_1^{P}, and $\mathsf{D}_1^{\mathsf{P}}$ are identical to NP, coNP, and DP, respectively.

2.4 Computational Problems

In this subsection, we summarize the computational problems described in this paper. Given a problem L, for every instance I of L, we define the size of I as the bit length for representing I.

Problem 1 (FFrobenius)**.**
Input: A set A of coprime integers $a_1, \cdots, a_n$ such that $2 \leq a_1 < \cdots < a_n$ and $n \geq 2$.
Output: $g(A)$.

Problem 2 (Frobenius)**.**
Instance: A pair (A, k), where A is a set of coprime integers $a_1, \cdots, a_n$ such that $2 \leq a_1 < \cdots < a_n$ and $n \geq 2$, and $k \in \mathbb{N}_+$.
Question: $g(A) \geq k$?

Problem 3 (coFrobenius)**.**
Instance: A pair (A, k), where A is a set of coprime integers $a_1, \cdots, a_n$ such that $2 \leq a_1 < \cdots < a_n$ and $n \geq 2$, and $k \in \mathbb{N}_+$.
Question: $g(A) < k$?

Problem 4 (Exact Frobenius)**.** *Instance: A pair (A, k), where A is a set of coprime integers $a_1, \cdots, a_n$ such that $2 \leq a_1 < \cdots < a_n$ and $n \geq 2$, and $k \in \mathbb{N}_+$.*
Question: $g(A) = k$?

Problem 5 (Frobenius-coFrobenius)**.** *Instance: A 4-tuple $(A_1, k_1; A_2, k_2)$, where (A_1, k_1) and (A_2, k_2) are instances of* Frobenius *and* coFrobenius*, respectively.*
Question: $g(A_1) \geq k_1$ and $g(A_2) < k_2$?

Problem 6 ($\Pi_2$3D Matching)**.**
Instance: A 5-tuple $(U_1, U_2, U_3, M_1, M_2)$, where U_1, U_2, U_3 are disjoint sets such that $|U_1| = |U_2| = |U_3| = q$ for some $q \in \mathbb{N}$, and $M_1, M_2 \subseteq U_1 \times U_2 \times U_3$.
Question: For every $\mu_1 \subseteq M_1$, is there $\mu_2 \subseteq M_2$ such that $\mu_1 \cup \mu_2$ is not a matching?
Comment: This problem was proven to be Π_2^{P}-complete [20], although she used the name "AE 3-dimensional matching" rather than $\Pi_2$3D Matching *in that paper.*

In this paper, we call a 3-dimensional matching simply a matching if no confusion arises. Moreover, we define the following two total orders in an instance of $\Pi_2$3D Matching, which are specified by the subscripts. For every $i \in [1,3]$, let $u_{i,1}, \cdots, u_{i,q}$ denote all elements of U_i. We define a relation $<$ on U_i as a total order such that $u_{i,1} < \cdots < u_{i,q}$. We define a relation $<$ on $U_1 \times U_2 \times U_3$ as a total order such that $(u_{1,j_1}, u_{2,j_2}, u_{3,j_3}) < (u_{1,k_1}, u_{2,k_2}, u_{3,k_3})$ if $(\overline{j_1}\ \overline{j_2}\ \overline{j_3})_{q+1} < (\overline{k_1}\ \overline{k_2}\ \overline{k_3})_{q+1}$ for every $j_1, j_2, j_3, k_1, k_2, k_3 \in [1,q]$.

Problem 7 (Integer Knapsack)**.**
Instance: A triple A, where A is a set of positive integers $a_1, \cdots, a_n$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$.
Question: Are there nonnegative integers $x_1, \cdots, x_n$ such that $\sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i a_i = k$?
Comment: This problem was proven to be NP-complete (Section 15.7 in [25]).

Problem 8 (Π_2Integer Knapsack)**.**
Instance: A triple (A, λ, υ), where A is a set of positive integers $a_1, \cdots, a_n$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and $\lambda, \upsilon \in \mathbb{N}_+$.
Question: For every $k \in [\lambda, \upsilon]$, are there nonnegative integers $x_1, \cdots, x_n$ such that $\sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i a_i = k$?

Furthermore, we define a subproblem of Π_2Integer Knapsack, which is associated with the Frobenius problem as follows.

Problem 9 (Π_2Assoc Integer Knapsack)**.**
Instance: A pair (A, λ), where $(A, \lambda, \lambda+c)$ is an instance of Π_2Integer Knapsack and $c = \min A - 1$.
Question: Is $(A, \lambda, \lambda + c)$ a yes instance of Π_2Integer Knapsack?

We introduce Π_2Assoc Integer Knapsack only for the simulation of coFrobenius. Although the restriction of Π_2Assoc Integer Knapsack appears to be unnatural, it suffices to argue the computational complexity of Π_2Assoc Integer Knapsack for proving the Σ_2^{P}-completeness of Frobenius.

Problem 10 (Σ_kSat, $k \geq 1$)**.**
Instance: A CNF formula φ over disjoint sets $X_1, \cdots, X_k$.
Question: $(\exists \sigma_1 \in \{0,1\}^{|X_1|})(\forall \sigma_2 \in \{0,1\}^{|X_1|}) \cdots (Q\sigma_k \in \{0,1\}^{|X_1|})[\varphi(\sigma_1 \cdots \sigma_k) = 1]$? Here, Q is the existential quantifier if k is odd; otherwise, it is the universal one.
Comment: This problem was proven to be Σ_2^{P}-complete [36].

Problem 11 (Π_kSat, $k \geq 1$)**.**
Instance: A CNF formula φ over disjoint sets $X_1, \cdots, X_k$.

Question: $(\forall \sigma_1 \in \{0,1\}^{|X_1|})(\exists \sigma_2 \in \{0,1\}^{|X_1|}) \cdots (Q\sigma_k \in \{0,1\}^{|X_1|})[\varphi(\sigma_1 \cdots \sigma_k) = 1]$*? Here, Q is the universal quantifier if k is odd; otherwise, it is the existential one.*
Comment: This problem was proven to be Π_2^{P}*-complete [36].*

Problem 12 (Σ_kSAT-Π_kSAT, $k \geq 1$)**.**
Instance: A pair (φ, ψ) *of CNF formulae over disjoint sets* $X_1, \cdots, X_k$*.*
Question: Are φ *and* ψ *yes instances of* Σ_kSAT *and* Π_k^{P}SAT*, respectively?*
Comment: This problem was proven to be $\mathsf{D}_2^{\mathsf{P}}$*-complete [35].*

2.5 Other Measure for Analyzing Computational Complexity

In this subsection, we define strong NP-hardness and its related concepts ([11], Section 4.2 in [12]). In this paper, we analyze the complexity of a problem primarily by using the bit length of a given instance as only one parameter. However, even if a problem L does not have an algorithm that is polynomial time in the bit length, the problem can have a polynomial-time algorithm under other assumptions for its parameters. Indeed, by measuring the complexity under a different assumption, we can refine many complexity classes. This measure is also useful if we study the approximability of computationally hard problems (Chapter 6 in [12], [34]).

Given a problem L and an instance I of L, if some components of I are integers, then we call the maximum magnitude of such integers the *unary size* of I. For example, for an instance (A, k) of FROBENIUS, the unary size of (A, k) is $\max(\{a\colon a \in A\} \cup \{k\})$. For a problem L, even if any instance I of L does not explicitly include any integer component, we can define the unary size of I by considering the labels of its components to be reasonably encoded to integers. For example, given an instance φ of SAT, we define the unary size of φ as the larger of the numbers of the clauses and variables. If necessary, we call the bit length of an input the *binary input* explicitly.

For any problem L, we call an algorithm A a *pseudopolynomial* algorithm for solving L if A can solve L in polynomial time in the unary and binary sizes. Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a complexity class. Moreover, let L be a $\mathcal{C}$-hard problem. Then, we say that L is *strongly* $\mathcal{C}$-hard if there is no pseudopolynomial algorithm for solving L; otherwise, we say that it is *weakly* $\mathcal{C}$-hard.

3 Π_2^{P}-Completeness of the Integer Knapsack Problem Associated with the Frobenius Problem

In this section, we prove the Π_2^{P}-completeness of Π_2ASSOC INTEGER KNAPSACK under Karp reductions. We construct a reduction from a Π_2^{P}-complete problem $\Pi_2$3D MATCHING to Π_2ASSOC INTEGER KNAPSACK. We first describe

the key concepts of the reduction by using examples in Subsection 3.1. Then, we prove the Π_2^{P}-completeness in Subsection 3.2.

3.1 Ideas of a Reduction from $\Pi_2$3D Matching to Π_2Assoc Integer Knapsack

In this subsection, we describe the key ideas of our reduction from $\Pi_2$3D Matching to Π_2Assoc Integer Knapsack by using examples. We observe an instance $P_1 = (W, X, Y, N_1, N_2)$ of $\Pi_2$3D Matching, where

$$\begin{aligned} &W = \{w_1, w_2, w_3, w_4\}, \quad X = \{x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4\}, \quad Y = \{y_1, y_2, y_3, y_4\}, \\ &N_1 = \{(w_1, x_1, y_2), (w_2, x_3, y_3)\}, \\ &N_2 = \{(w_1, x_1, y_1), (w_2, x_2, y_1), (w_2, x_2, y_2), (w_3, x_2, y_1), \\ &\qquad (w_3, x_2, y_2), (w_3, x_3, y_3), (w_4, x_4, y_4)\}. \end{aligned}$$

From Table 1, we find that P_1 is a yes instance. For the given P_1, we construct an instance $\psi(P_1) = (\Psi(P_1), \lambda(P_1))$ of Π_2Assoc Integer Knapsack as follows. Table 2 illustrates the form of representations that we construct for every triple in $N_1 \cup N_2$. For every triple in $W \times X \times Y$, we construct 15-place 5-representations. In Subsections 3.1.1, 3.1.2, and 3.1.3, we will describe the details of the representations in the 2-nd to 4-th columns of Table 2.

Table 1: Subsets ν_2 of N_2 for all subsets ν_1 of N_1 such that $\nu_1 \cup \nu_2$ is a matching

ν_1 (subsets of N_1)	ν_2 (subsets of N_2)
$\emptyset$	$\{(w_1, x_1, y_1), (w_2, x_2, y_2), (w_3, x_3, y_3), (w_4, x_4, y_4)\}$
$\{(w_1, x_1, y_2)\}$	$\{(w_2, x_2, y_1), (w_3, x_3, y_3), (w_4, x_4, y_4)\}$
$\{(w_2, x_3, y_3)\}$	$\{(w_1, x_1, y_1), (w_3, x_2, y_2), (w_4, x_4, y_4)\}$
$\{(w_1, x_1, y_2), (w_2, x_3, y_3)\}$	$\{(w_3, x_2, y_1), (w_4, x_4, y_4)\}$

3.1.1 Simulation of Matchings

In this subsection, we explain the details of the 4th column of Table 2. To simulate matchings in P_1, for every triple in $W \times X \times Y$, we use 12-place 5-representations, which we call *match testing representations*. The base 5 of a match testing representation is equal to $q+1$, where q is the cardinality of each set of W, X, and Y. This equality is for keeping the consistency in a simulation of a union operation in $\Pi_2$3D Matching by using additions of integers in Π_2Assoc Integer Knapsack. We describe the details below. The 4-th column of Table 2 illustrates the form of the match testing representations for every triple in $W \times X \times Y$. A match testing representation consists of three distinct parts: one each for W, X, and Y. Each part consists of 4 digits. Each digit in each part corresponds to a variable in

Table 2: Constructed representations, where the shaded rows correspond to triples in N_1 and the others in N_2 and $\mathsf{i}, \mathsf{j}, \mathsf{k} \in [0, 4]$ and $\mathsf{h} \in [1, 4]$

Triples	Addition limiting representations	Universal quantification testing representations	Match testing representations
(w_1, x_1, y_1)	$\overline{1}$	$\overline{0}\ \overline{0}$	$\overline{000\mathsf{i}}\ \overline{000\mathsf{j}}\ \overline{000\mathsf{k}}$
(w_1, x_1, y_2)	$\overline{1}$	$\overline{0}\ \overline{\mathsf{h}}$	$\overline{000\mathsf{i}}\ \overline{000\mathsf{j}}\ \overline{00\mathsf{k}0}$
(w_2, x_2, y_1)	$\overline{1}$	$\overline{0}\ \overline{0}$	$\overline{00\mathsf{i}0}\ \overline{00\mathsf{j}0}\ \overline{000\mathsf{k}}$
(w_2, x_2, y_2)	$\overline{1}$	$\overline{0}\ \overline{0}$	$\overline{00\mathsf{i}0}\ \overline{00\mathsf{j}0}\ \overline{00\mathsf{k}0}$
(w_2, x_3, y_3)	$\overline{1}$	$\overline{\mathsf{h}}\ \overline{0}$	$\overline{00\mathsf{i}0}\ \overline{0\mathsf{j}00}\ \overline{0\mathsf{k}00}$
(w_3, x_2, y_1)	$\overline{1}$	$\overline{0}\ \overline{0}$	$\overline{0\mathsf{i}00}\ \overline{00\mathsf{j}0}\ \overline{000\mathsf{k}}$
(w_3, x_2, y_2)	$\overline{1}$	$\overline{0}\ \overline{0}$	$\overline{0\mathsf{i}00}\ \overline{00\mathsf{j}0}\ \overline{00\mathsf{k}0}$
(w_3, x_3, y_3)	$\overline{1}$	$\overline{0}\ \overline{0}$	$\overline{0\mathsf{i}00}\ \overline{0\mathsf{j}00}\ \overline{0\mathsf{k}00}$
(w_4, x_4, y_4)	$\overline{1}$	$\overline{0}\ \overline{0}$	$\overline{\mathsf{i}000}\ \overline{\mathsf{j}000}\ \overline{\mathsf{k}000}$

the corresponding set. Let r be the representation $\overline{0\mathsf{i}00}\ \overline{00\mathsf{j}0}\ \overline{00\mathsf{k}0}$, i.e., the one in the 4th column and the 7th row in Table 2. The subrepresentation $r[9, 12] = \overline{0\mathsf{i}00}$ means that w_3 is the third element of W; $r[5, 8] = \overline{00\mathsf{j}0}$ means that x_2 is the second of X; and $r[1, 4] = \overline{00\mathsf{k}0}$ means that y_2 is the second of Y.

By the above description, we can easily observe that if a subset ν of $W \times X \times Y$ is a matching, then we can find a match testing representation $r(t)$ for every $t \in \nu$ such that $\sum_{t \in \nu} r(t)$ is in $\overline{[0, 4]}^{12}$. However, the converse does not necessarily hold due to carries in additions. For example, $\overline{1111}\ \overline{1111}\ \overline{1111}$ can be written as the sum of 4 match testing representations

$$\overline{0002}\ \overline{0002}\ \overline{0002}, \quad \overline{0004}\ \overline{0004}\ \overline{0004}, \quad \overline{0100}\ \overline{0100}\ \overline{0100}, \quad \overline{1000}\ \overline{1000}\ \overline{1000}$$

although the set $\{(w_1, x_1, y_1), (w_3, x_3, y_3), (w_4, x_4, y_4)\}$ of the corresponding triples is not a matching. Next, let us consider the restriction that the number of added representations is at most 4. Under this restriction, $\overline{4444}\ \overline{4444}\ \overline{4444}$ can be written as the sum of match testing representations only if the corresponding triples is a matching. This property is due to the fact that the base is greater than the number of added representations. In addition, by construction, if $\overline{4444}\ \overline{4444}\ \overline{4444}$ can be written as the sum of 4 match testing representations, then any representation in $\overline{[0, 4]}^{12}$ can be also written as the sum of 4 match testing representations. Consequently, a subset of $W \times X \times Y$ is a matching if and only if every integer in $[0, (5^{12} - 1)]$ can be written as the sum of integers that correspond to match testing representations.

3.1.2 Simulation of Universal Quantification

In this subsection, we explain the details of the 3rd column of Table 2. By using the representations in this column, we check whether, in Π_2ASSOC INTEGER KNAPSACK, every subset of N_1 forms a matching together with a subset of N_2. To simulate this check, we use 2-place 5-representations, which we call *universal quantification testing representations*, for every triple in N_1. In a universal quantification testing representation, the i-th digit corresponds to the i-th element of N_1. In particular, if k is in $[1, 4]$, then $\overline{0\mathsf{k}}$ corresponds to (w_1, x_1, y_2), which is the smallest element of N_1, and $\overline{\mathsf{k}0}$ corresponds to (w_2, x_3, y_3), which is the 2nd smallest element of N_1. We can observe the relationship between subsets of N_1 and sums of universal quantification testing representations in Table 3.

Table 3: Sums of the universal quantification testing representations for subsets of N_1.

Subsets of N_1	Sums of the corresponding universal quantification testing representations	Corresponding integers
$\emptyset$	$\overline{00}$	0
$\{(w_1, x_1, y_2)\}$	$\overline{0\mathsf{k}}$ $(\mathsf{k} \in [1, 4])$	$(\overline{0\mathsf{k}})_5 \in [1, 4]$
$\{(w_2, x_3, y_3)\}$	$\overline{\mathsf{k}0}$ $(\mathsf{k} \in [1, 4])$	$(\overline{\mathsf{k}0})_5 \in \{5, 10, 15, 20\}$
$\{(w_1, x_1, y_2), (w_2, x_3, y_3)\}$	$\overline{\mathsf{jk}}$ $(\mathsf{j}, \mathsf{k} \in [1, 4])$	$(\overline{\mathsf{jk}})_5 \in [6, 24] \backslash \{10, 15, 20\}$

As in the discussion for match testing representations in Subsection 3.1.1, we can observe the following. For any $\nu_1 \subseteq N_1$, let $S(\nu_1)$ denote the set $\{5d_2+d_1 \colon d_i \in [1, 4]$ if the i-th element of N_1 is in ν_1; and $d_i = 0$ otherwise for each i of 1 and 2$\}$. Then, $\nu_1 \subseteq W \times X \times Y$ is a subset of N_1 if and only if every integer in $S(\nu_1)$ can be written as the sum of integers corresponding to the universal quantification testing representations. Notably, $\bigcup_{\mu \subseteq N_1} S(\mu)$ is an interval although $S(\nu_1)$ may not be an interval for any $\nu_1 \subseteq N_1$. We can observe that the set of integers at all the cells in the 3rd column of Table 3 is the interval $[0, 24]$.

Moreover, we define the universal quantification testing representations for every triple of N_2 as $\overline{00}$.

3.1.3 Construction of Integers and Intervals

In this subsection, we explain the details of the 2nd column of Table 2. For simulating an instance of $\Pi_2$3D MATCHING, we construct 15-place 5-representations such that the following condition is satisfied. If R is a set of 15-place 5-representations that corresponds to a matching, then the sum of all elements of R is in

$$[\overline{4}\ \overline{00}\ \overline{0000}\ \overline{0000}\ \overline{0000}\ ,\ \overline{4}\ \overline{44}\ \overline{4444}\ \overline{4444}\ \overline{4444}].$$

For this purpose, for every 15-place 5-representation, we use a single digit $\overline{1}$, which we call its *addition limiting representation*. We place it as the most significant digit of every 15-place 5-representation. Then, we define $\Psi(P_1)$ as the set of all 15-place 5-representations $\overline{1}r_{\mathrm{u}}(t)r_{\mathrm{m}}(t)$, where $t \in W \times X \times Y$ and $r_{\mathrm{u}}(t)$ and $r_{\mathrm{m}}(t)$ are universal quantification and match testing representations for t, respectively. In addition, we define $\lambda(P_1)$ as $(\overline{4}\ \overline{00}\ \overline{0000}\ \overline{0000}\ \overline{0000})_5$, i.e., $4 \cdot 5^{14}$. Moreover, the smallest element of $\Psi(P_1)$ is $(\overline{1}\ \overline{00}\ \overline{0000}\ \overline{0000}\ \overline{0000})_5$, i.e., 5^{14}.

Given a set τ of triples in $W \times X \times Y$, for verifying whether τ is a matching, it suffices to check whether the sum of all elements in $\Psi(\tau)$ is in $[4 \cdot 5^{14}, (5^{15} - 1)]$. Table 4 illustrates a set of integers constructed from a matching in P_1. We can observe the following. For a subset $\{(w_2, x_3, y_3)\}$ of N_1, there is a subset

$$\{(w_1, x_1, y_1),\quad (w_3, x_2, y_2),\quad (w_4, x_4, y_4)\}$$

of N_2 such that the union is a matching. The sum of the 4 integers in the 1st column is $(\overline{4}\ \overline{40}\ \overline{4444}\ \overline{4444}\ \overline{4444})_5$. This sum is in $[4 \cdot 5^{14}, (5^{15} - 1)]$.

Table 4: Example of a tuple of constructed integers whose sum corresponds to a matching

Constructed integers					Corresponding triples
$(\overline{1}$	$\overline{40}$	$\overline{0040}$	$\overline{0040}$	$\overline{0400})_5$	$(w_2, x_3, y_3) \in N_1$
$(\overline{1}$	$\overline{00}$	$\overline{0004}$	$\overline{0004}$	$\overline{0004})_5$	$(w_1, x_1, y_1) \in N_2$
$(\overline{1}$	$\overline{00}$	$\overline{0400}$	$\overline{0040}$	$\overline{0040})_5$	$(w_3, x_2, y_2) \in N_2$
$(\overline{1}$	$\overline{00}$	$\overline{4000}$	$\overline{4000}$	$\overline{4000})_5$	$(w_4, x_4, y_4) \in N_2$

3.2 The Π_2^{P}-Completeness of Π_2Assoc Integer Knapsack

In this subsection, we prove Π_2Assoc Integer Knapsack to be Π_2^{P}-complete under Karp reductions. As the hardness part of the proof, we reduce $\Pi_2$3D Matching to Π_2Assoc Integer Knapsack as informally described in Subsection 3.1. $\Pi_2$3D Matching is known to be Π_2^{P}-complete under Karp reductions [20].

Theorem 1. Π_2Assoc Integer Knapsack *is* Π_2^{P}*-complete under Karp reductions.*

Proof. We first prove Π_2Assoc Integer Knapsack to be in Π_2^{P}. More generally, we show that Π_2Integer Knapsack is in Π_2^{P}. Let (A, λ, υ) be an instance of Π_2Integer Knapsack. By definition, every integer in the interval $[\lambda, \upsilon]$ can be represented as a binary representation of polynomial length in the input. Moreover, for every integer k in $[\lambda, \upsilon]$, we can check whether there are nonnegative integers $x_1, \cdots, x_n$ such that $\sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i a_i = k$, where

$\{a_1, \cdots, a_n\} = A$, in polynomial time by using INTEGER KNAPSACK (Section 15.7 in [25]) as an oracle. INTEGER KNAPSACK is known to be an NP-complete problem (Section 15.7 in [25]). Thus, Π_2INTEGER KNAPSACK is in Π_2^{P}.

Then, we will prove Π_2ASSOC INTEGER KNAPSACK to be Π_2^{P}-hard under Karp reductions. For this purpose, we reduce $\Pi_2$3D MATCHING to Π_2ASSOC INTEGER KNAPSACK. In particular, we formulate the mapping ψ as described in Subsection 3.1. Let $P = (U_1, U_2, U_3, M_1, M_2)$ be fixed to an instance of $\Pi_2$3D MATCHING. Let q be the cardinality of U_1, i.e., $|U_1| = |U_2| = |U_3| = q$. Then, we will define an instance $\psi(P) = (\Psi(P), \lambda(P))$ of Π_2ASSOC INTEGER KNAPSACK, where $\Psi(P)$ and $\lambda(P)$ are defined as follows.

For every $1 \leq i \leq 3$, let $u_{i,1}, \cdots, u_{i,q}$ be all elements of U_i. Let b be integer $q + 1$. The integer b is the basis of all representations that we construct. Let $t = (u_{1,j_1}, u_{2,j_2}, u_{3,j_3})$ be a triple in $U_1 \times U_2 \times U_3$, where $j_1, j_2, j_3 \in [1, q]$. Then, we define $R_{\mathrm{m}}(t)$ as the set of all b-representations of the form

$$\underbrace{\overline{0} \ \cdots \ \overline{0}}_{(q-j_1)\text{ digits}} \ \overline{d}_1 \ \underbrace{\overline{0} \ \cdots \ \overline{0}}_{(j_1-1)\text{ digits}} \ \underbrace{\overline{0} \ \cdots \ \overline{0}}_{(q-j_2)\text{ digits}} \ \overline{d}_2 \ \underbrace{\overline{0} \ \cdots \ \overline{0}}_{(j_2-1)\text{ digits}} \ \underbrace{\overline{0} \ \cdots \ \overline{0}}_{(q-j_3)\text{ digits}} \ \overline{d}_3 \ \underbrace{\overline{0} \ \cdots \ \overline{0}}_{(j_3-1)\text{ digits}},$$

where $d_1, d_2, d_3 \in [0, q]$. Let $t_1, \cdots, t_{|M_1|}$ be all elements of M_1, where $t_1 < \cdots < t_{|M_1|}$. For every $1 \leq k \leq |M_1|$, we define $R_{\mathrm{u}}(t_k)$ as the set of all b-representations of the form

$$\underbrace{\overline{0} \ \cdots \ \overline{0}}_{(|M_1|-k)\text{ digits}} \ \overline{d} \ \underbrace{\overline{0} \ \cdots \ \overline{0}}_{(k-1)\text{ digits}},$$

where $d \in [1, q]$.

For every $t \in (U_1 \times U_2 \times U_3) \backslash M_1$, we define $R_{\mathrm{u}}(t)$ as the set $\{\overline{0}^{|M_1|}\}$. For any $s \in U_1 \times U_2 \times U_3$, we define $\Gamma(s)$ as the set $\{\overline{1}\, \alpha\, \beta \colon \alpha \in R_{\mathrm{u}}(s), \beta \in R_{\mathrm{m}}(s)\}$. Let r be a representation in $\bigcup_{s \in U_1 \times U_2 \times U_3} \Gamma(s)$. Then, we call $r[1, 3q]$, $r[3q + 1, 3q + |M_1|]$, and $r[3q + |M_1| + 1]$ the *match testing*, *universal quantification testing*, and *addition limiting* representations for r, respectively. For any $s \in U_1 \times U_2 \times U_3$, we define $\Psi(s)$ as the set $\{(\alpha)_b \colon \alpha \in \Gamma(s)\}$. For any $S \subseteq U_1 \times U_2 \times U_3$, we define $\Psi(S)$ as the set $\bigcup_{s \in S} \Psi(s)$. We define $\Psi(P)$ as the set $\Psi(M_1) \cup \Psi(M_2)$. We define $\lambda(P)$ as integer $(\overline{q}\ \overline{0}^{3q+|M_1|})_b$.

Given P, we can compute $\psi(P)$ in polynomial time as Algorithm 1. In Algorithm 1, the innermost loop is in lines 10-13. By definition, $|M_1 \cup M_2|$ is less than or equal to q^3. Thus, the loop at lines 5-20 is repeated at most q^3 times. In each iteration of the loop at lines 5-20, the loop at lines 6-19 is repeated at most $(q-1)^3$ times. In each iteration of the loop at lines 6-19, the loop at lines 7-18 is repeated at most q^3 times. In each iteration of the loop at lines 7-18, the loop at lines 10-13 is repeated at most $(q-1)^3$ times. Thus, we can compute $\psi(P)$ in time with polynomial order in q.

ALGORITHM 1: Reduction from Π_2Assoc Integer Knapsack to $\Pi_2$3D Matching

Input: $P = (U_1, U_2, U_3, M_1, M_2)$.
Output: $\psi(P)$.

for *each set* S *of* M_1, M_2, U_1, U_2, *and* U_3 **do**
    Sort all the elements of S in ascending order
end
$A \longleftarrow \emptyset$;
for *every triple* $t = (u_1, u_2, u_3) \in M_1 \cup M_2$ **do**
    for *every* $i_1, i_2, i_3 \in [1, q]$ **do**
        for *every* d_1, $d_2, d_3 \in [0, q]$ **do**
            if $t \in M_1$ **then**
                $i_0 \longleftarrow$ (an integer such that t is the i_0-th smallest element of M_1);
                for *every* $d_0 \in [1, q]$ **do**
                    $c \longleftarrow$
                    $(\overline{1}\,\overline{0}^{|M_1|-i_0}\,\overline{d_0}\,\overline{0}^{i_0-i_1+q-1}\,\overline{d_1}\,\overline{0}^{i_1-i_2+q-1}\,\overline{d_2}\,\overline{0}^{i_2-i_3+q-1}\,\overline{d_3}\,\overline{0}^{i_3-1})_b$;
                    $A \longleftarrow A \cup \{c\}$;
                end
            else
                $c \longleftarrow$
                $(\overline{1}\,\overline{0}^{|M_1|-i_1+q-1}\,\overline{d_1}\,\overline{0}^{i_1-i_2+q-1}\,\overline{d_2}\,\overline{0}^{i_2-i_3+q-1}\,\overline{d_3}\,\overline{0}^{i_3-1})_b$;
                $A \longleftarrow A \cup \{c\}$;
            end
        end
    end
end
$e \longleftarrow \min A$;
return (A, e);

In the remainder of the proof, we confirm the validity of the reduction. In particular, we prove that P is a yes instance of $\Pi_2$3D Matching if and only if $\psi(P)$ is a yes instance of Π_2Assoc Integer Knapsack. We first show the *"only if"* part of the proof. Let $\mu_1 \subseteq M_1$ and $\mu_2 \subseteq M_2$ such that $\mu_1 \cup \mu_2$ is a matching. Let $t_1, \cdots, t_\xi$ be all elements of μ_1, where $t_1 < \cdots < t_\xi$. Let $t_{\xi+1}, \cdots, t_q$ be all elements of μ_2, where $t_{\xi+1} < \cdots < t_q$. Let $r = \overline{d_{\alpha+1}} \cdots \overline{d_1}$ be a b-representation such that $\overline{q}\overline{0}^{\alpha} \leq r \leq \overline{q}^{\alpha+1}$, where $\alpha = 3q + |M_1|$. Then, it suffices to show the following statement (I).

(I) *We can find* $r_k \in \Gamma(t_k)$ *for every* $1 \leq k \leq q$ *such that* $\sum_{k=1}^{q} r_k = r$.

By construction, for every $1 \leq k \leq \xi$, we can find $r_k \in \Gamma(t_k)$ of the form

$$\overline{1}\ \underbrace{\overline{0}\ \cdots\ \overline{0}}_{(|M_1|-k_0)\text{ digits}}\ \overline{d_{3q+k_0}}\ \underbrace{\overline{0}\ \cdots\ \overline{0}}_{(q+k_0-k_1-1)\text{ digits}}\ \overline{d_{2q+k_1}}$$
$$\underbrace{\overline{0}\ \cdots\ \overline{0}}_{(q+k_1-k_2-1)\text{ digits}}\ \overline{d_{q+k_2}}\ \underbrace{\overline{0}\ \cdots\ \overline{0}}_{(q+k_2-k_3-1)\text{ digits}}\ \overline{d_{k_3}}\ \underbrace{\overline{0}\ \cdots\ \overline{0}}_{(k_3-1)\text{ digits}},$$

where t_k is the k_0-th smallest element of M_1, and for every $1 \leq i \leq 3$, the i-th component of t_k is the k_i-th smallest element of U_i. Similarly, by construction, for every $\xi + 1 \leq k \leq q$, we can find $r_k \in \Gamma(t_k)$ of the form

$$\overline{1}\ \underbrace{\overline{0}\ \cdots\ \overline{0}}_{(q+|M_1|-k_1)\text{ digits}}\ \overline{d_{2q+k_1}}\ \underbrace{\overline{0}\ \cdots\ \overline{0}}_{(q+k_1-k_2-1)\text{ digits}}$$
$$\overline{d_{q+k_2}}\ \underbrace{\overline{0}\ \cdots\ \overline{0}}_{(q+k_2-k_3-1)\text{ digits}}\ \overline{d_{k_3}}\ \underbrace{\overline{0}\ \cdots\ \overline{0}}_{(k_3-1)\text{ digits}},$$

where for every $1 \leq i \leq 3$, the i-th component of t_k is the k_i-th smallest element of U_i. By the assumption that $\mu_1 \cup \mu_2$ is a matching, the following holds. For every i and j with $1 \leq i < j \leq q$, if c_i and c_j are the l-th components of t_i and t_j for some $1 \leq l \leq 3$, respectively, then $c_i \neq c_j$ Thus, for every i and j with $1 \leq i < j \leq q$, there is no $1 \leq p \leq 3q + |M_1|$ such that $r_i[p] \neq \overline{0}$ and $r_j[p] \neq \overline{0}$. Consequently, statement (I) holds.

Next, we show the *"if"* part. The proof for this part requires more careful arguments. We prove the following statement. Let $n_1, \cdots, n_\kappa$ denote integers in $\Psi(P)$, where $n_1 \leq \cdots \leq n_\kappa$ and $\kappa \in \mathbb{N}_+$. Let I be a subset of $[3q + 1, 3q + |M_1|]$.

(II) *If* $\sum_{k=1}^{\kappa} n_k = \sum_{k \in [1,3q] \cup I \cup \{3q+|M_1|\}} qb^{k-1}$, *then we can find a matching* $\{t_1, \cdots, t_\kappa\}$ *such that* $n_i \in \Psi(t_i)$ *for every* $1 \leq i \leq \kappa$.

For every $i \in [1, \kappa]$, let r_i denote the b-representation of n_i. Let r denote the $\sum_{i=1}^{\kappa} r_i$. To prove statement (II), we show the following statements.

(III) $\kappa = q$.

(IV) *For every* $p \in [1, 3q] \cup I$, *there is exactly one* r_k, *where* $k \in [1, \kappa]$, *such that* $r_k[p] \neq \overline{0}$.

By definition, if statement (IV) is satisfied, then we can obtain a matching $\{t_1, \cdots, t_\kappa\}$ from $r_1, \cdots, r_\kappa$. Let us prove statement (III). By definition, the most significant digit of any representation in Γ is $\overline{1}$. Thus, since

$r[3q + |M_1| + 1] = \overline{q}$, κ is less than or equal to q. By definition, for every $1 \leq i \leq \kappa$, the match testing representation of r_i consists of at most 3 non-zero digits. Moreover, by definition, the match testing representation of r is $\overline{q}^{3q}$. Thus, κ is greater than or equal to q. Consequently, $\kappa = q$. Next, assume that there is $j \in [1, 3q] \cup I$ such that $r_k[j] = \overline{0}$ for every $k \in [1, \kappa]$. Then, at most $\kappa - 1$ carries occur at the $(j-1)$-th digits in additions of $n_1, \cdots, n_\kappa$. It follows that $r[j]$ is at most $\kappa - 1$, i.e., at most $q - 1$ by statement (III). This contradicts the assumption that every digit of r is $\overline{q}$. Thus, statement (IV) holds. The proof of Theorem 1 is complete. □

4 The Σ_2^{P}-Completeness of Frobenius under Karp Reductions

In this section, we prove the Σ_2^{P}-completeness of FROBENIUS under Karp reductions. This is the main theorem of this paper. We will obtain this theorem as a corollary of a theorem that coFROBENIUS is Π_2^{P}-complete under Karp reductions. In Subsection 4.1, we observe differences in instances of Π_2ASSOC INTEGER KNAPSACK and coFROBENIUS. In Subsection 4.2, we describe the key concepts of our reduction from Π_2ASSOC INTEGER KNAPSACK and coFROBENIUS. In Subsection 4.3, we prove the theorems.

4.1 Differences in instances of Π_2Assoc Integer Knapsack and coFrobenius

The definition of Π_2ASSOC INTEGER KNAPSACK is similar to that of coFROBENIUS. However, there are three main differences. The first difference is whether given positive integers may include integer 1. An instance of Π_2ASSOC INTEGER KNAPSACK may include 1, although all given positive integers are greater than or equal to 2 in coFROBENIUS. The second difference is the number of given positive integers. The number is greater than or equal to 0 in Π_2ASSOC INTEGER KNAPSACK, whereas the number is greater than or equal to 2 in coFROBENIUS. The third difference is whether all given positive integers are coprime. They may be not coprime in Π_2ASSOC INTEGER KNAPSACK, whereas they are subject to be coprime in coFROBENIUS.

4.2 Main Ideas of Our Reduction

In this subsection, we describe the main ideas of our reduction. Let $Q = (A, \lambda)$ be an instance of Π_2ASSOC INTEGER KNAPSACK, where $|A| = n$ for some $n \geq 0$. Let $a_1, \cdots, a_n$ be all elements of A, where $1 \leq a_1 < \cdots < a_n$. If $a_1 \geq 2$, $|A| \geq 2$, and $a_1, \cdots, a_n$ are coprime, then Q is also an instance of coFROBENIUS.

If $a_1 = 1$, then Q is a yes instance, not depending on the other elements of A and the integer λ. In this case, any positive integer can be written as

a multiple of a_1, i.e., as a nonnegative integer combination of A. Thus, in this case, it suffices to correspond Q to a yes instance of coFROBENIUS.

In the case where $a_1 \neq 1$, if $|A| = 1$ or $a_1, \cdots, a_n$ are not coprime, then Q is a no instance of Π_2ASSOC INTEGER KNAPSACK. For example, if $A = \{2\}$, i.e., $a_1 = 2$, then no odd integer can be written as a multiple of a_1. As another example, we observe the case where $A = \{3, 6, 9\}$ and $\lambda = 11$. Then, the interval that we should check is $[11, 12, 13]$. However, we cannot represent integers 11 and 13 as a nonnegative integer combination of A since these are not multiples of k. Hence, Q is a no instance. Thus, in the case where $a_1 \neq 1$, if $|A| = 1$ or $a_1, \cdots, a_n$ are not coprime, then it suffices to correspond Q to a no instance of coFROBENIUS.

In coFROBENIUS, if the number of input integers is two, then we know the Frobenius number by a formula (Section 2.1 in [27]). Furthermore, given any instance (A, k), every integer greater than $g(A)$ can be represented as a nonnegative integer combination of A. Thus, we can easily find both yes instances and no instances. For example, we observe the case in which $\{3, 4\}$ is a given input. Then, since the Frobenius number is $3 \cdot 4 - 3 - 4 = 5$, the integer 5 cannot be represented as a nonnegative integer combination $\{3, 4\}$, and each of the integers $6, 7, 8$ can be represented as a nonnegative integer combination of $\{3, 4\}$. Thus, we find $(\{3, 4\}, 6)$ to be a yes instance and $(\{3, 4\}, 5)$ to be a no instance.

In coFROBENIUS, an instance (B, k) is a yes instance if all integers in a "sufficiently" large interval can be represented as a nonnegative integer combination of B. We do not know the smallest sufficient length of intervals. However, if all integers in $[l, l+\min B-1]$ can be represented as a nonnegative integer combination of B for some integer l, then $g(B)$ is less than l.

4.3 A Main Theorem

In this subsection, by showing the following theorem, we obtain the Σ_2^{P}-completeness of FROBENIUS under Karp reductions.

Theorem 2. coFROBENIUS *is* Π_2^{P}*-complete under Karp reductions.*

Proof. We first prove the membership of coFROBENIUS to Π_2^{P}. Let (A, k) be an instance of coFROBENIUS. We denote all elements of A by $a_1, \cdots, a_n$. Let U be a_n^2. U is known to be an upper bound of $g(A)$ due to Wilf [33]. In other words, to check whether every integer $m \geq k$ can be represented as a nonnegative integer combination of A, it suffices to check all integers that are less than or equal to U. By definition, U can be represented as a binary representation whose length is of polynomial order in the size of (A, k). Let (A, k) be a yes instance. Then, for all integers m in the interval $[k, U]$, we can determine whether m can be represented as a nonnegative integer combination of A in polynomial time by using INTEGER KNAPSACK as its oracle.

Integer Knapsack is known to be an NP-complete problem (Section 15.7 in [25]). Consequently, coFrobenius is in Π_2^{P}.

Then, we prove the Π_2^{P}-hardness of coFrobenius by constructing a reduction from Π_2Assoc Integer Knapsack. In particular, we formulate the reduction informally described in Subsection 4.2. Let $Q = (A, \lambda)$ be an instance of Π_2Assoc Integer Knapsack. Let $a_1, \cdots, a_n$ be all elements of A, where $1 \leq a_1 < \cdots < a_n$. We construct an instance $\phi(Q) = (\phi(A), \phi(\lambda))$ of coFrobenius, where $\phi(Q)$ is defined as follows.

$$(\phi(A), \phi(\lambda)) = \begin{cases} (A, \lambda) & \text{if } a_1 \geq 2; |A| \geq 2; \text{and all elements of } A \text{ are coprime,} \\ (\{3, 4\}, 6) & \text{if } a_1 = 1, \\ (\{3, 4\}, 5) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

We can determine whether $a_1 \geq 2$ and whether $|A| \geq 2$ in linear time. Furthermore, we can check the coprimality of A in polynomial time since we can compute its coprimality by using Euclid's algorithm at most n times. Euclid's algorithm can be executed in polynomial time (Section 4.5.2 in [17]). Consequently, given Q, we can construct $\varphi(Q)$ in polynomial time. By the description in Subsection 4.2, the reduction is valid. The proof of Theorem 2 is complete. □

As a corollary, we obtain the main theorem.

Theorem 3. Frobenius *is* Σ_2^{P}*-complete under Karp reductions.*

5 The Complexity of the Original Version of the Frobenius Problem

In this section, we describe the computational complexity of the original version of the Frobenius problem FFrobenius. Theorem 3 immediately implies an upper bound for the complexity of FFrobenius, which is the first nontrivial upper bound. Moreover, we can also obtain an improved lower bound. Additionally, we discuss the further improvement of these bounds.

5.1 Upper Bounds for the Complexity Class of FFrobenius

By using Theorem 3, we can derive an upper bound for the complexity class of FFrobenius using usual methods in complexity theory as follows.

Theorem 4. FFrobenius *is in* $\mathsf{F}\Delta_3^{\mathsf{P}}$.

Proof. Recall that FFrobenius is identical to g. For proving the theorem, it suffices to show that we construct a polynomial-time algorithm that outputs $g(A)$ with a Σ_2^{P}-oracle L for a given input A. Let $a_1, \cdots, a_n$ be all elements

in A, where $a_1 < \cdots < a_n$. Let U_A be a_n^2, which is an upper bound for $g(A)$ [33]. We find the Frobenius number $g(A)$ among integers in $[a_1, U_A]$ by the binary search in Algorithm 2.

ALGORITHM 2: Binary Search for the Frobenius Number

Input: $A = \{a_1, \cdots, a_n\}$.
Output: $g(A)$.

```
1  l ⟵ a_1;
2  u ⟵ U_A;
3  v ⟵ ⌊(l + u)/2⌋;
4  while u ≠ l do
5      if g(A) ≥ v then
6          l ⟵ v + 1;
7      else
8          u ⟵ v − 1;
9      end
10     v ⟵ ⌊(l + u)/2⌋;
11 end
12 return v;
```

For the comparison $g(A) \geq v$ at Step 3, we use FROBENIUS as an oracle. By this oracle, we can run the above algorithm in polynomial time. By Theorem 3, FFROBENIUS is in $\mathsf{FP}^{\Sigma_2^{\mathsf{P}}}$, i.e., $\mathsf{F}\Delta_3^{\mathsf{P}}$. □

5.2 Lower Bounds for the Complexity Class of FFrobenius

By Theorem 3, FFROBENIUS is at least as hard as any Σ_2^{P} problem. This is because we can immediately determine whether $g(A) \geq k$ by computing $g(A)$, i.e., solving FFROBENIUS for a given instance (A, k) of FROBENIUS. However, there should be a better lower bound for the complexity of FFROBENIUS. Ideally, we are expected to find a complexity class of functions as a better lower bound.

We obtained $\mathsf{F}\Delta_3^{\mathsf{P}}$ as an upper bound in Subsection 5.1 Thus, it is natural to ask whether FFROBENIUS is $\mathsf{F}\Delta_3^{\mathsf{P}}$-hard. This question appears to be not easy. Known $\mathsf{F}\Delta_3^{\mathsf{P}}$-complete problems are few [8]. Moreover, the structures of such $\mathsf{F}\Delta_3^{\mathsf{P}}$-complete problems and FFROBENIUS are quite different. Thus, constructing a reduction should require some sophisticated techniques. A class of functions, Σ_2^{MM}, is another candidate of a lower bound, which was introduced in [19]. This class is a subclass of $\mathsf{F}\Delta_3^{\mathsf{P}}$. Every function of Σ_2^{MM} is specified by a type of alternating Turing machine, called a *polynomial k-alternating max-min Turing machine*. Unfortunately, known results are scarce.

Natural characterizations of $\mathsf{F}\Delta_k^{\mathsf{P}}$ and Σ_k^{P} are given as generalizations for other complexity classes [19]. However, some classes of functions have

only characterizations by specific structures. For example, PLS [15] and PPAD [24] are known to be such classes of functions. PLS and PPAD are known to have complete problems [15, 24]. By an analogy of PLS and PPAD, we may obtain a suitable complexity class for FFROBENIUS. However, this paper does not cover this approach since it appears to require a brand-new investigation for the property of FFROBENIUS.

By the above discussion, finding a function class that is harder than Σ_2^{P} is not easy. The next best approach is finding a decision problems class that is harder than Σ_2^{P} and easier than $\mathsf{F}\Delta_3^{\mathsf{P}}$. Thus, it is worthwhile to investigate a problem EXACT FROBENIUS and a class $\mathsf{D}_2^{\mathsf{P}}$ of decision problems. By definition, the class $\mathsf{D}_2^{\mathsf{P}}$ is harder than Σ_2^{P}. EXACT FROBENIUS is expected to be harder than FROBENIUS by an analogy to relationships between three variants of the traveling salesman problem [23]. The first variant is deciding the existence of a Hamilton path whose cost is at most k for a given graph G and a cost k. The second one is deciding the existence of a Hamilton path whose cost is exactly k for a given graph G and a cost k. The third one is computing a Hamilton path whose cost is minimum for a given graph G. The third one is known to be harder than the second, and the second is known to be harder than the first [23]. Moreover, the second one was proven to be DP-complete [23]. If we prove the $\mathsf{D}_2^{\mathsf{P}}$-hardness of EXACT FROBENIUS, then we may obtain a better lower bound for FFROBENIUS. However, the analysis for the $\mathsf{D}_2^{\mathsf{P}}$-hardness of EXACT FROBENIUS is not easy. In this paper, we prove only the membership of EXACT FROBENIUS to $\mathsf{D}_2^{\mathsf{P}}$.

Theorem 5. EXACT FROBENIUS *is in* $\mathsf{D}_2^{\mathsf{P}}$.

Proof. It suffices to show that there are two problems $L_1 \in \Sigma_2^{\mathsf{P}}$ and $L_2 \in \Pi_2^{\mathsf{P}}$ such that $L_1 \cap L_2 =$ EXACT FROBENIUS. Let L_1 be FROBENIUS. Let L_2 be a language such that $(A, k) \in L_2$ if and only if $(A, k+1) \in$ coFROBENIUS. Obviously, the language L_2 is in Π_2^{P}. Let (A, k) be an instance of EXACT FROBENIUS. Then, (A, k) is a yes instance of EXACT FROBENIUS, i.e., $g(A) = k$ if and only if (A, k) and $(A, k+1)$ are yes instances of L_1 and L_2, i.e., $g(A) \geq k$ and $g(A) < k+1$. It follows that EXACT FROBENIUS is in $\mathsf{D}_2^{\mathsf{P}}$. □

We describe some reasons for the difficulties of the proof or disproof for the $\mathsf{D}_2^{\mathsf{P}}$-hardness of EXACT FROBENIUS. The existing $\mathsf{D}_2^{\mathsf{P}}$-complete problems can be categorized into two types. The first is a type of problem such as Σ_2SAT-Π_2SAT [35]. The second is a type of problem such as INCOMPLETE GAME [35]. Any instance of Σ_2SAT-Π_2SAT [35] is specified by a pair of instances of Σ_2^{P}- and Π_2^{P}-problems. This type of $\mathsf{D}_2^{\mathsf{P}}$-complete problem is immediately obtained from a number of Σ_2^{P}- or Π_2^{P}-complete problems [29]. We can prove that FROBENIUS-coFROBENIUS is $\mathsf{D}_2^{\mathsf{P}}$-complete by a reduction similar to that in the proof of Theorem 3, Any reduction from this type of problem to EXACT FROBENIUS appears to require an outstanding result in number theory.

The second type of problem is problems such as a cooperative game in [35], called IncompleteGame. Three variants of package recommendation problems in [8] are also of this type. This type of problem has the following properties. Any instance of such a problem is specified by a complicated formulation. For example, an instance of IncompleteGame has two types of variables, called agents and goals, and a relation between the two sets of variables. Such formulations are natural and reasonable since those studies were motivated by concerns for the computational complexities of problems in a specific research domain. Indeed, [35] studied the computational complexities of 10 or more cooperative games including IncompleteGame. [8] investigated many properties of recommendation systems from a complexity theoretical perspective. In compensation for a sufficiently powerful description, the formulation of this type of problem is too complicated to use as a reduced problem in a proof for the hardness of another problem. That is, the reduction from this type of problem to ExactFrobenius may require a novel technique of formulation or patience for a long description.

6 The Strength of the Σ_2^{P}-Hardness of the Frobenius Problem

In this section, we analyze the Σ_2^{P}-hardnesses of Frobenius and FFrobenius more precisely. In Section 4, we proved the Σ_2^{P}-completeness of Frobenius. However, many researchers have considered solving FFrobenius practically fast, as described in Subsection 1.2. Their algorithms are exact algorithms. Thus, the approximability of FFrobenius is an interesting subject. We do not know the existence of an approximation algorithm or any inapproximability for FFrobenius. However, there is a pseudopolynomial algorithm for FFrobenius. To the best of the author's knowledge, an explicit statement has not been provided, but some reports in the literature implicitly suggest the existence of a pseudopolynomial algorithm, e.g., [22, 5, 6]. By this fact and Theorem 3, we obtain the following.

Theorem 6. *(1)* Frobenius *is weakly* Σ_2^{P}*-complete. (2)* FFrobenius *is weakly* Σ_2^{P}*-hard.*

Proof. Statements (1) and (2) are proven in almost the same way. Thus, we only prove statement (2). By [22], $g(A)$ can be computed by the following algorithm for a given set A of coprime positive integers $a_1, \cdots, a_n$. This algorithm is for a single-source shortest path search for a weighted directed graph $G = (V, E)$ defined from A. The set V of vertices is defined as $[0, a_1 - 1]$, and the set E of edges is defined as $\{(i, j) \colon i \in V, j = (i + a_l) \mod a_1$ for some $1 \leq l \leq n\}$. For every edge (i, j) in E, the distance of (i, j) is defined as a_l such that $j = (i + a_l) \mod a_1$, where $1 \leq l \leq n$. Then, the distance v between vertex 0 and the farthest vertex is known to be equal to

$g(A)+a_1$ [22]. This algorithm runs in time with an order polynomial in n but in time with an order exponential in $\log a_1$. However, if we restrict instances of FROBENIUS to pairs $E = \{e_1, \cdots, e_m\}$ such that $m = \Omega(e_1)$, then the above algorithm is a polynomial-time algorithm for n and $\sum_{i=1}^{n}(\lfloor \log e_i \rfloor + 1)$. It follows that the algorithm of [22] is a pseudopolynomial algorithm. Thus, by Theorem 3, FFROBENIUS is a weakly Σ_2^{P}-hard problem. □

Many weakly NP-hard problems have a fully polynomial-time approximation scheme (FPTAS) [11]. Thus, FFROBENIUS might also have an FPTAS. However, it is known that not all weakly NP-hard problems have an FPTAS [34]. Moreover, there has not been much attention on approximation for Σ_2^{P}-hard problems. A result for the approximability of FFROBENIUS may have a significant effect for computational complexity theory.

7 Conclusions and Future Work

In this paper, as a main theorem, we proved the Σ_2^{P}-completeness of a decision version of the Frobenius problem under Karp reductions. This result is an answer for the long-standing open problem proposed by Ramírez-Alfonsín (Section A.1 in [27]). This result provided the first nontrivial upper bound and an improved lower bound for the computational complexity of the original version of the Frobenius problem. Moreover, as a further improvement trial, we proved the membership of EXACT FROBENIUS to $\mathsf{D}_2^{\mathsf{P}}$. For developing practically fast algorithms, although our Σ_2^{P}-completeness proof for FROBENIUS showed a negative fact, we also pointed out a positive aspect that FFROBENIUS is not strongly Σ_2^{P}-hard. On the other hand, this paper leaves the following questions open.

Conjecture 1. *Is* EXACT FROBENIUS $\mathsf{D}_2^{\mathsf{P}}$*-complete under Karp reductions?*

Conjecture 2. *Is* FFROBENIUS $\mathsf{F}\Delta_3^{\mathsf{P}}$*-complete or* $\mathcal{C}$*-complete under Levin reductions, where* $\mathcal{C}$ *is some subclass of functions of* $\mathsf{F}\Delta_3^{\mathsf{P}}$*?*

Many Σ_2^{P}-complete problems have been known prior to this work [29]. However, among those Σ_2^{P}-complete problems, number theory problems are few. A computational good property of the Frobenius problem can be derived by a future sophisticated result in number theory. That is, our Σ_2^{P}-completeness proof for FROBENIUS may become a trigger for resolving some important open questions in theoretical computer science, such as NP vs Σ_2^{P}. For example, there are the following possibilities. By developing a proof technique that applies a new characterization of the Frobenius number, we may prove the existence of some instances that cannot be solved in nondeterministic polynomial time. Conversely, by finding a subproblem of the Frobenius problem, which can simulate a Σ_2^{P}-complete problem and can be solved in nondeterministic polynomial time, we may obtain the result

that $\mathsf{NP} = \Sigma_2^{\mathsf{P}}$. Naturally, it appears to be highly unlikely, and discovering such a subproblem is quite difficult. However, since several subproblems that can be efficiently computed are known (Sections 3.3 and 3.7 in [27]), the existence of such an NP algorithm could be expected.

References

[1] Iskander M. Aliev and Peter M. Gruber. An optimal lower bound for the Frobenius problem. *Journal of Number Theory*, 123(1):71–79, 2007.

[2] Sanjeev Arora and Boaz Barak. *Computational Complexity: a Modern Approach*. Cambridge University Press, New York, NY, 2009.

[3] Alexander Barvinok and Kevin Woods. Short rational generating functions for lattice point problems. *Journal of the American Mathematical Society*, 16(4):957–979, 2003.

[4] Matthias Beck and Sinai Robins. *Computing the Continuous Discretely: Integer-Point Enumeration in Polyhedra*, chapter The Coin-Exchange Problem of Frobenius, pages 3–26. Springer, New York, 2015.

[5] Dale Beihoffer, Jemimah Hendry, Albert Nijenhuis, and Stan Wagon. Faster algorithms for Frobenius numbers. *The Electronic Journal of Combinatorics*, 12(#R27), 2005.

[6] Sebastian Böcker and Zsuzsanna Lipták. A fast and simple algorithm for the money changing problem. *Algorithmica*, 48(4):413–432, 2007.

[7] J.L. Davison. On the linear Diophantine problem of Frobenius. *Journal of Number Theory*, 48(3):353–363, 1994.

[8] Ting Deng, Wenfei Fan, and Floris Geerts. On the complexity of package recommendation problems. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 42(5):1940–1986, 2013.

[9] David Einstein, Daniel Lichtblau, Adam Strzebonski, and Stan Wagon. Frobenius numbers by lattice point enumeration. *Integers*, 7(1):A15, 2007.

[10] P Erdös and Ronald L Graham. On a linear Diophantine problem of Frobenius. *Acta Arithmetica*, 21(1):399–408, 1972.

[11] Michael R Garey and David S Johnson. "strong" NP-completeness results: Motivation, examples, and implications. *J. ACM*, 25(3):499–508, July 1978.

[12] Michael R Garey and David S Johnson. *Computers and Intractability: a Guide to NP-Completeness*. WH Freeman, New York, NY, 1979.

[13] Venkatesan Guruswami, Daniele Micciancio, and Oded Regev. The complexity of the covering radius problem. *computational complexity*, 14(2):90–121, 2005.

[14] Richard Guy. *Unsolved Problems in Number Theory*. Springer, New York, NY, third edition, 2004.

[15] David S. Johnson, Christos H. Papadimitriou, and Mihalis Yannakakis. How easy is local search? *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 37(1):79–100, 1988.

[16] Ravi Kannan. Lattice translates of a polytope and the Frobenius problem. *Combinatorica*, 12(2):161–177, 1992.

[17] Donald E. Knuth. *The Art of Computer Programming, Seminumerical Algorithms*, volume 2. Addison-Wesley Longman Publishing Co., Inc., Boston, MA, third edition, 1997.

[18] Hugo Krawczyk and Azaria Paz. The Diophantine problem of Frobenius: a close bound. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 23(3):289–291, 1989.

[19] Mark W. Krentel. Generalizations of opt p to the polynomial hierarchy. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 97(2):183–198, 1992.

[20] A. McLoughlin. The complexity of computing the covering radius of a code. *Information Theory, IEEE Transactions on*, 30(6):800–804, November 1984.

[21] A. R. Meyer and L. J. Stockmeyer. The equivalence problem for regular expressions with squaring requires exponential space. In *Proceedings of the 13th Annual Symposium on Switching and Automata Theory*, SWAT '72, pages 125–129, Washington, DC, USA, 1972. IEEE Computer Society.

[22] Albert Nijenhuis. A minimal-path algorithm for the "money changing problem". *The American Mathematical Monthly*, 86(10):832–835, 1979.

[23] C.H. Papadimitriou and M. Yannakakis. The complexity of facets (and some facets of complexity). *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 28(2):244–259, 1984.

[24] Christos H. Papadimitriou. On the complexity of the parity argument and other inefficient proofs of existence. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 48(3):498–532, 1994.

[25] Christos H. Papadimitriou and Kenneth Steiglitz. *Combinatorial Optimization: Algorithms and Complexity*. Prentice-Hall, Inc., Upper Saddle River, NJ, 1982.

[26] Jorge L Ramírez Alfonsín. Complexity of the Frobenius problem. *Combinatorica*, 16(1):143–147, 1996.

[27] Jorge L Ramírez Alfonsín. *The Diophantine Frobenius Problem*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2005.

[28] Bjarke Hammersholt Roune. Solving thousand-digit Frobenius problems using Gröbner bases. *Journal of Symbolic Computation*, 43(1):1–7, 2008.

[29] Marcus Schäfer and Christopher Umans. Completeness in the polynomial-time hierarchy: Part I: a compendium. *SIGACT News*, 33(4):22–36, December 2002.

[30] Larry J. Stockmeyer. The polynomial-time hierarchy. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 3(1):1–22, 1976.

[31] J. J. Sylvester. On subvariants, i.e. semi-invariants to binary quantics of an unlimited order. *American Journal of Mathematics*, 5(1):79–136, 1882.

[32] Christopher Umans. The minimum equivalent DNF problem and shortest implicants. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 63(4):597–611, 2001.

[33] Herbert S. Wilf. A circle-of-lights algorithm for the "money-changing problem". *The American Mathematical Monthly*, 85(7):562–565, 1978.

[34] Gerhard J. Woeginger. When does a dynamic programming formulation guarantee the existence of a fully polynomial time approximation scheme (FPTAS)? *INFORMS Journal on Computing*, 12(1):57–74, 2000.

[35] Michael Wooldridge and Paul E Dunne. On the computational complexity of qualitative coalitional games. *Artificial Intelligence*, 158(1):27–73, 2004.

[36] Celia Wrathall. Complete sets and the polynomial-time hierarchy. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 3(1):23–33, 1976.